DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 326 527 SP 032 776

AUTHOR Richardson, Gloria; Sistrunk, Walter E.
TITLE Supervision, Burnout, and Evaluation of Instruction.
PUB DATE Nov 90
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, November 13-16, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Instructional Improvement; Principals; Secondary Education; *Secondary School Teachers; *Supervisory Methods; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Burnout; *Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Mississippi

ABSTRACT

This study sought to determine whether there was a significant difference between Mississippi teachers' perceptions of principals' supervisory behaviors and teachers' perceptions of burnout. Data were obtained from 120 Mississippi secondary school teachers. Two instruments were used: the Maslach Burnout Inventory Form Ed (MBI) and the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form One (SBDQ). Significant differences were found for the Depersonalization subscale of the MBI and both Directive and Collaborative dimensions for the Evaluation of Instruction on the SBDQ. Teachers reported both high and moderate levels of Depersonalization with Collaborative behaviors and lower levels with Directive supervisory behaviors. The conclusion was that teachers preferred the principal to evaluate with Directive behaviors. Teachers indicated more depersonalization and, therefore, less satisfaction when required to collaborate. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED326527

Supervision, Burnout, and Evaluation of Instruction

Gloria Richardson and Walter E. Sistrunk

Mississippi State University
Meridian

A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of
Mid-South Educational Research Association
New Orleans, LA
November 13-16, 1990

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D. Richardson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Running Head: SUPERVISION AND BURNOUT

SP032 776

"SUPERVISION, BURNOUT, AND EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION"

Dr. Gloria Richardson, Adjunct Faculty,
Mississippi State University-Meridian
and
Dr. Walter Sistrunk,
Mississippi State University-Meridian

The problem in this study was to determine if there was a significant difference between perceived supervisory behaviors and perceived burnout. Data were obtained from 120 secondary teachers in randomly-selected schools having any or all of grades nine through 12. Respondents included two each in English, math, science, and social studies. Two instruments were used: the Maslach Burnout Inventory Form Ed and the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form One.

Data were analyzed with oneway analysis of variance and Scheffe' post hoc tests. Significant differences were found for the Depersonalization subscale of the MBI and both Directive and Collaborative dimensions for Evaluation of Instruction on the SBDQ. Teachers reported both high and moderate levels of Depersonalization with Collaborative

behaviors and lower levels with Directive supervisory behaviors.

The conclusion was that teachers preferred the principal to evaluate with Directive behaviors. Teachers indicated more depersonalization, and therefore less satisfaction, when required to collaborate.

Future studies to examine personality, burnout, and supervisory behaviors are planned.

"SUPERVISION, BURNOUT, AND EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION"

Dr. Gloria Richardson, Adjunct Faculty,
Mississippi State University-Meridian
and
Dr. Walter Sistrunk,
Mississippi State University-Meridian

Introduction

The search for a timely, effective and objective method of evaluation of instruction and instructors appears to be an endless quest. There are as many opinions concerning how it should be done as there are people to have those opinions. Teachers hold varying opinions themselves; and administrators and parents' opinions differ strategically from the teachers' opinions. The question of objectivity versus subjectivity is the most frequently voiced concern. Traditionally, teachers have held a biased view of the evaluation process. The fact that evaluation is not always taken seriously by teachers or administrators reveals the questionability of the process itself.

From its foundation, America's educational system had evaluation of instruction and instructors as a cornerstone. Evaluation has remained a component of

education throughout its history with degree of emphasis shifting during different trends and phases. Renewed interest in evaluation surfaced during the era of educational reforms. This was only one element considered essential to improve education in these reforms; however, it was one of the significant issues because it focused on the teachers' ability and motivation to teach and on the quality of the instruction experienced by the students. Emphasis on the expertise supervisors demonstrated in executing evaluation also increased. Many states required additional, or first-time, training for administrators and supervisors to improve the reliability of these observations.

While the intents, purposes, and programs developed under the education reform acts remain, has there been much change in evaluation of instructors and instruction? We hear more today about collaboration, and authorities seem to thrive on the use of catch-words such as peer coaching, clinical supervision, and teacher empowerment; but what does this mean to teachers and administrators who have committed themselves to the instruction of children and youth in

our public schools? Richardson (1987) found that instructional supervisors did not spend as much time on program evaluation as they desired and, therefore, experienced role conflict due to lack of time for this aspect of the supervisory process. According to Drake (1984), "both [teachers and administrators, sic] profess the value and necessity for evaluation but neither believe that it can be effectively accomplished" Drake (1984) stated that two problems exist in the consideration of evaluation. One is to develop and improve valid appraisal procedures. The other is to "create greater understanding of the limitations of appraisal devices so that results from them will NOT be misused" (p. 21). Soar, Medley, and Coker (1983) claimed that existing evaluation methods were inadequate and recommended performance-based and empirically tested evaluation procedures. Harris (1975) regarded clinical use of evaluation as a potential agent for improved teaching skills because it was highly personalized. Diamond (1980) explored supervision from the humanistic and clinical format and stressed the inclusion of teachers in the process of

determining supervisory objectives; he favored on-site visits to make supervision more clinical.

Garawski (1980) recommended collaboration between administrators and teachers to share responsibility for producing the best educational program possible. Norris (1980) advocated multi-dimensional teacher evaluation rather than evaluation based on data gathered from one source. Norris (1980) suggested that evaluation be completed only after the supervisor had offered the teacher a choice of potential rating instruments and favored training in the processes or evaluation for the supervisory personnel. In his synthesis of the literature on evaluation Weber (1987) offered the following conclusions: supervisors must work with teachers individually; there should be a feeling of reciprocity, or mutual respect, between evaluator and teacher; teachers should give input and/or be allowed to participate in devising and implementing evaluation plans; and the evaluator should not subject the teacher to negative or unwanted summative procedures, since the object of evaluation was instructional improvement.

In his study of the teacher evaluation process, Tobia (1984) found evidence that involving teachers in the process was positively related to teacher attitude toward evaluation. Cameron (1985) researched clinical and traditional supervisory methods to determine that a "significant difference existed between teachers who had clinical supervisors and teachers who had traditional principals" (p. 2321). Clinical supervisors spent more time in the classroom and were perceived more favorably; clinical supervision produced higher job satisfaction. Marquit (1968) found that principals' perception of supervisory behavior differed significantly from teachers' perceptions where evaluation was concerned. Winstead (1966) found that teachers did not believe that principals performed their supervisory functions satisfactorily.

Because of the interrelationship of supervisory behaviors and teachers' perceptions of their jobs, an investigation of literature was made to identify areas of stress. One common source of stress reported was the supervisory behavior of the principal. Metz (1980) found that major sources of professional burnout included: administrative incompetence,

bureaucratization, lack of administrative support, and lack of positive feedback. Westerhouse (1980) found that school administrators rated bureaucratic activities higher than professional activities in determining positive teacher evaluations. Litt and Turk (1986) included supervisory evaluation as an aspect of job tension in a study which also included lack of participation in decision making, concern for teachers' problems, and interest in professional development; these variables proved to be significant and were considered to be contributors to teachers' distress and dissatisfaction. Cichon and Koff (1980) found that disagreement with the supervisor ranked twelfth on their Teacher Stress Events Inventory when 4,934 Chicago teachers were surveyed. Earlier literature indicates a relationship between supervisory behaviors and burnout.

METHOD

To determine if there was a significant relationship between Mississippi teachers' perceptions of burnout and their perceptions of their principals' supervisory behavior, an answer was sought to the following question: Were there significant differences

between teachers' perceptions of high, moderate or low levels of burnout, as measured by the Maslach Burnout Inventory Form Ed, (MBI Form Ed) and their perceptions of their principals' supervisory behaviors, as measured by the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire, (SBDQ), Form 1, Subscales 1, 2, 5, and 8? The MBI Form Ed (Maslach, 1982) contained three subscales: Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, and Personal Accomplishment. Four Subscales of the SBDQ, Form 1 (Sistrunk, 1982) were utilized: 1. Curriculum Development; 2. Instructional Organization; 5. Staff Development; and 8. Evaluation of Instruction and Instructors. The variables of interest for this report were Depersonalization and Evaluation of Instruction and Instructors. An analysis of responses from 120 teachers from Mississippi secondary schools containing any or all of grades nine through 12 revealed that two dimensions of supervisory behaviors measured by the SBDQ, Form 1, were significant: Directive and Collaborative. The Non-Directive Dimension of the SBDQ, Form 1, did not prove to be significant; likewise, the MBI Form Ed Subscales of Emotional Exhaustion and Personal Accomplishment were not

significant for the SBDQ, Form 1, Subscale of Evaluation of Instruction and Instructors.

RESULTS

Data for the Depersonalization subscale of the MBI, Form Ed and Subscale 8 are found in Evaluation of Instruction and Instructors on the SBDQ, Form 1.

Insert Table 1 About Here

Examination of the data for the Subscales of Depersonalization and Evaluation of Instruction and Instructors revealed that both the Directive dimension and the Collaborative dimensions of the SBDQ, Form 1, were significant. The Directive dimension was significant at the .05 level of confidence with an F Ratio of 8.691 ($F \geq 3.07$; df 2,117). Central tendency data are shown in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 About Here

Group 1 (High DP) had 53 respondents with a mean score of 2.66. Group 2 (Moderate DP) had 34 respondents with a mean score of 2.62. Group 3 (Low DP) had 33 respondents with a mean score of 4.48. Results of the Scheffe' post hoc procedure are shown in Table 3 and indicated two pairs of groups significantly different at the .05 level of confidence.

Insert Table 3 About Here

The means of Group 3 (Low DP) and Group 2 (Moderate DP) were significantly different. Also, the means of Group 3 (Low DP) and Group 1 (High DP) were significantly different. Teachers perceived lower levels of Depersonalization under the Directive dimension of supervisory behaviors of their principals when being evaluated or when engaged in evaluation of instruction.

For the Collaborative dimension of the subscale of Evaluation of Instruction and Instructors on the SBDQ, Form 1, and the subscale of Depersonalization of the MBI, Form Ed shown in Table 1, there was a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence with an F Ratio of 4.779 ($F \geq 3.07$; df 2,117). Central tendency data are shown in Table 2. Group 1 (High DP) had 53 respondents with a mean score of 3.62. Group 2 (Moderate DP) had 34 respondents with a mean score of 2.06. Results of the Scheffe' post hoc procedure shown in Table 3 indicated that the pairs of groups

significantly different at the .05 level of confidence were Group 2 (Moderate DP) and Group 3 (Low DP) and Group 1 (High DP) and Group 3 (Low DP). Teachers indicated both high and moderate levels of depersonalization when the principals engaged in evaluation of instruction and instructors with collaborative supervisory behaviors.

DISCUSSION

Freudenberger (1985) defined the burnout stage of depersonalization "as characterized by serious disengagement; self-negation; meaninglessness of priorities; a sense of compressed time; and cold, aloof, drifting, and untouchable behavior" (pp 86-112). With this definition in mind, examination of the data concerning Depersonalization as measured by the MBI Form Ed revealed that teachers perceived lower levels of depersonalization when the principals engaged in evaluation of instruction and instructors with directive supervisory behaviors. This perception represented the strongest relationship in the study. This finding indicated that the usual or anticipated stress of evaluation might be ameliorated by the attention gained from the pre-conference, evaluation,

and post-conference activities with a principal who is traditional, organized, commanding in nature, and requires specific procedures. The principal exhibiting directive behaviors would also base his or her behaviors on modeling, directing, and measuring proficiency levels. This outcome of the research also indicated that teachers realize that there is a normal behavior pattern established by group consensus over a period of time, and that there is no alternative but to submit to directive supervisory behaviors and to make the best of it. For many teachers who prefer autonomy in the classroom, this traditional requirement fulfills the expectation of what supervisory limits the teacher is willing to permit. Directive supervisory behavior seems more appropriate because of historical acceptance; whereas, peer supervision, peer coaching, and other clinical methods of supervision have a generally low acceptance among teachers. Teachers have been required to submit to more rigorous evaluation standards since Mississippi Educational Reform Act of 1982; but, traditionally, teachers expect to be evaluated, either formally or informally, at the principals' discretion to fulfill the requirements of

the local district and the State Department of Education. In the past, very little involvement with the process of evaluation was required other than to "entertain" the principal for anything from two minutes to an entire period, a duty to be routinely completed with as little interest or value as possible because evaluation was viewed as an objectionable practice. Role expectations for teachers and principals did not vary much from year to year over a long period of time. Evaluation procedures were developed or "borrowed" and handed down from the upper levels of the power structure to the principal who implemented them with an often fatalistic and casual attitude. Current practices frequently do not differ radically from this established pattern. For example, Tobia (1984) found that more than 50 percent of his research sample reported no involvement with the development of any of the seven components in the evaluation process examined. Thirty-five percent of Tobia's sample reported no involvement with the evaluation process at all; however, Tobia found some evidence that involving teachers in the evaluation process was positively related to teacher attitude toward evaluation. Soar,

Medley, and Coker (1983) stated that "teachers' resistance to evaluation is reasonable, if that evaluation is subjective, unreliable, open to bias, closed to public scrutiny, and based on irrelevancies" (pp. 239-246). These authors called for evaluation which focused on performance but which was soundly and empirically developed rather than a rating given on how favorably the teacher impressed the rater.

Until effective methods of evaluation of instruction and instructors are identified, perfected, and established in all districts, the procedure will remain questionable. It is necessary to evaluate performance, but this evaluation should have some foundation and consequence for the instruction of the children who are in the classrooms of each district, each state, and our nation. Opinions will continue to be held based on bias, prejudice, tradition, knowledge, and sometimes even ignorance. A reliable, objective method of evaluation must be achieved to prevent depersonalization among teachers. The consequences of depersonalization for the instructional time of students are enormous. With the growing need for the restructuring of American schools, we should consider

the significance of inadvisable methods of evaluation or the use of satisfactory methods in an improper manner. It is time to approach the problems of evaluation with a new perspective, however comfortable we may appear to have become with the status quo.

TABLE 1

A comparison of Teachers' Perceptions of their Levels of Depersonalization on the MBI Form Ed and their Perceptions of their Principals' Supervisory Behaviors on the Dimensional Scores of the SBDQ, Form I, Subscale 8: Evaluation of Instruction and Instructors.

Variable	SS	MS	F Ratio
Directive	81.1414	40.5707	8.691*
Collaborative	57.3998	28.6999	4.779*
Non-Directive	2.1713	1.0857	.352

*F Ratio significant at the .05 level (F > 3.07; df 2,117)

TABLE 2

A Comparison of Central Tendency Data for Teachers' Perceptions of their levels of Depersonalization on the MBI Form Ed and Their Perceptions of their Principals' Supervisory Behaviors When Evaluating Instruction and Instructors on the SBDQ, Form 1.

Variable	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	F Ratio
Directive*				8.691*
Group 1 (High DP)	53	2.6604	2.1834	
Group 2 (Moderate DP)	34	2.6176	1.9850	
Group 3 (Low DP)	33	4.4848	2.2929	
TOTAL	120	3.1500	2.2960	
Collaborative*				4.779*
Group 1 (High DP)	53	3.6226	2.5437	
Group 2 (Moderate DP)	34	2.5882	2.6528	
Group 3 (Low DP)	33	2.0606	2.0454	
TOTAL	120	3.1833	2.5271	
Non-Directive				.352
Group 1 (High DP)	53	1.7170	1.7473	
Group 2 (Moderate DP)	34	1.7941	1.6657	
Group 3 (Low DP)	33	1.4545	2.0324	
TOTAL	120	1.6667	1.7979	

*Indicates significance of F Ratio at .05 level ($F > 3.07$; df 2,117)

TABLE 3

A comparison of Scheffe' Post Hoc Results for the Depersonalization Subscale of the MBI Form Ed and The Evaluation of Instruction and Instructors subscale of the SBDQ, Form 1.

Variable	F Ratio	Results
Directive	8.691*	Group 3 (Low DP) > Group 1 (High DP)
		Group 2 (Moderate DP) > Group 1 (High DP)
Collaborative	4.779*	Group 2 (Moderate DP) > Group 3 (Low DP)
		Group 1 (High DP) > Group 3 (Low DP)
Non-Directive		Not significant

References

Cameron, G. J. (1985). The effects of clinical and traditional supervision methods on the satisfaction levels of higher and lower-order need teachers (Doctoral dissertation). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 2321A.

Cichon, D. J. & Koff, Robert H. (1980). Stress and teaching. NASSP Bulletin, 64 (434), 91-104.

Diamond, S. (1989). Micro-supervisory experience, humanistic and clinical format. NASSP Bulletin, 64 (434), 25-29.

Drake, J. M. (1984). Improving teacher performance through evaluation and supervision. Las Vegas, NV: Annual meeting of NASSP. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 250 782)

Freudenberger, H. J. & North, G. (1985). Woman's burnout: How to spot it, how to reverse it, and how to prevent it. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company.

Garawski, R. A. (1980). Successful teacher evaluation is not a myth. NASSP Bulletin, 64 (434), 1-7.

Harris, B. (1975). Supervisory behavior in education (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Litt, M. D. & Turk, D. C. (1986). Sources of stress and dissatisfaction in experienced high school teachers. The Journal of Educational Research. 78 (3), 178-185.

Marquit, L. J. (1968). Perceptions of the supervisory behavior of secondary school principals in selected schools in New York State (Doctoral Dissertation). Dissertation Abstracts International, 28, 4420A-4421A.

Maslach, C. & Jackson, S. E. (1981). Maslach burnout inventory manual (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Metz, P. K. (1980). An exploratory study of professional burnout and renewal among educators (Doctoral Dissertation). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 4308A-4309A.

Norris, W. R. (1980). Seven premises for improving teacher evaluation. NASSP Bulletin, 64 (434), 30-37.

Richardson, S. C. (1987, November). Actual and ideal role perception of instructional supervisors in public schools in Virginia. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration, Gatlinburg, TN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 288 262).

Sistrunk, W. E. (1981). A manual for the administration of the supervisory behavior description questionnaires, Forms 1 and 2.

Soar, R. S., Medley, D. M., & Cook, H. (1983). Teacher Evaluation: A critique of currently used methods. Phi Delta Kappan, 65 (4), 239-246.

Tobia, E. F. (1984). The relationship between teacher participation in the development of a teacher evaluation process and teacher attitude toward evaluation (Doctoral Dissertation). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 47A.

Weber, J. R. (1987). Teacher evaluation as a strategy for improving instruction, Synthesis of literature. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 287 213)

Westerhouse, M. A. (1980). The effects of tenure, role conflict, and role conflict resolution on the work orientation and burnout of teachers (Doctoral Dissertation). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 174A-175A.

Winstead, P. D., Jr. (1966). A study of the responsibilities of the secondary school principal in instructional supervision in North Carolina (Doctoral Dissertation). Dissertation Abstracts International, 27, 1618A-1619A.